

### **REMARKS**

In the November 23, 2005 final Office Action, claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10-14 and 20 stand finally rejected in view of prior art. Also, claim 10 was rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. On the other hand, claims 18 and 19 were allowed. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the allowance of these claims and the thorough examination of this application. Claims 9 and 15-17 were withdrawn from consideration as being directed to non-elected species. No other objections or rejections were made in the Office Action.

#### ***Status of Claims and Amendments***

In response to the November 23, 2005 final Office Action, Applicant has amended claims 3-5, 7, 12, 15 and 16, and cancelled claims 1, 2, 8-11 and 20, as indicated above in order to accept allowable subject matter. Basically, the rejected and non-elected claims have either been cancelled or amended to depend from independent claim 18, which was allowed. Non-elected claim 9 has been cancelled, while non-elected claims 15-17 have been amended to now depend from independent claim 18, which was allowed. Claim 6 was previously cancelled. Thus, claims 3-5, 7 and 12-19 are now pending, with claim 18 being the only independent claim.

Applicant believes that independent claim 18 is generic to both the first embodiment (elected Species I, illustrated in Figures 1-9) and the fifth embodiment (Species V illustrated in Figure 16). Thus, it is respectfully requested that non-elected claims 15-17, which are directed to species V, be rejoined in this application.

Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of above amendments and the following comments.

#### ***Election of Species***

In paragraphs 2 and 3 (page 2) of the final Office Action, Applicant's election of Species I, illustrated in Figures 1-9, *without traverse* in the reply filed April 14, 2005 was acknowledged. Thus, non-elected claims 9 and 15-17 were withdrawn from further consideration. However, as mentioned above, Applicant respectfully requests that non-elected claims 15-17, which now depend from allowed claim 18, be rejoined in this application in accordance with U.S. patent practice.

As mentioned above, Applicant believes that independent claim 18 is generic to both the first embodiment (elected Species I, illustrated in Figures 1-9) and the fifth embodiment (non-elected Species V, illustrated in Figure 16).

***Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102***

In paragraph 5 (pages 2-6) of the final Office Action, claims 1-5, 7, 8 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,910,193 to Chen. In response, these rejected claims have either been cancelled or amended to depend from independent claim 18, which was allowed. Accordingly, this rejection is now believed to be moot.

***Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103***

In paragraph 6 (pages 6-8) of the final Office Action, claims 10-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,775,168 to Furuta. In response, these rejected claims have either been cancelled or amended to depend from independent claim 18, which was allowed. Accordingly, this rejection is now believed to be moot.

***Double Patenting***

In paragraph 7 (pages 8-9) of the final Office Action, claim 10 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,647,823. In response, claim 10 has been cancelled by the current Amendment. Accordingly, this rejection is now believed to be moot.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

In paragraph 8 (page 9) of the final Office Action, claims 18 and 19 were allowed. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the allowance of these claims and the thorough examination of this application. In response, the rejected and non-elected claims have either been cancelled or amended to depend from independent claim 18, which was allowed. Accordingly, Applicant believes that all of the currently pending claims 3-5, 7 and 12-19 are now in condition for allowance.

***Response to Arguments***

In paragraph 9 (pages 9-11) of the Office Action, the Office Action basically indicates that Applicant's arguments (i.e., of the September 22, 2005 Amendment) are not persuasive, and provides reasoning for this assertion. Applicant believes these comments in the Office Action are moot in view of the foregoing Amendments and comments.

\* \* \*

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 3-5, 7 and 12-19 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested. If there are any questions regarding this Amendment, please feel free to contact the undersigned

Respectfully submitted,



Patrick A. Hilsmier  
Reg. No. 46,034

SHINJYU GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP  
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202)-293-0444  
Dated: January 31, 2006

G:\01-JAN06-YTY\SN-US035024 Amendment.doc